DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 281 EC 002 104

THE CHANGING AMERICAN SCENE AS IT RELATES TO HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES FOR VISUALLY HANDICAPPED; AN INSTITUTE FOR EXECUTIVES AND BOARD MEMBERS OF AGENCIES SERVING VISUALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONS IN REGION I (AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS, APRIL 19-21, 1967).

American Foundation for the Blind, New York, N.Y.

Pub Date 21 Apr 67

Note-37p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.56

Descriptors-*ADMINISTRATION, AGENCIES, CONFERENCE REPORTS, *EXCEPTIONAL CHILD SERVICES, FEDERAL AID, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATIVE BODY), INTERAGENCY PLANNING, *PROGRAM PLANNING, SOCIAL SERVICES, *VISUALLY HANDICAPPED, VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

The proceedings of a conference of executives and board members of agencies serving visually handicapped persons consider social welfare programing and practice. Major addresses include "A Time of Change--A Challenge to Administrators" by James Dumpson and "The Gap in Our Services--A Government Responsibility" by Eleanor Smith. Summaries are provided of discussions on the roles of the government and voluntarism in service provision, board and executive responsibility for problem solving, and implications for administrative practice. Also given are a synopsis of the program and lists of the planning committee and the participants. (JD)

THE CHANGING AMERICAN SCENE

As It Relates to Health,

Education and Welfare Services

for Visually Handicapped

EC 002 104

ADMINISTRATIVE INSTITUTE
AMHURST, MASSACHUSETTS

APRIL 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE CHANGING AMERICAN SCENE

As It Relates to Health, Education and Welfare Services for Visually Handicapped

An Institute
for Executives and Board Members of Agencies
Serving Visually Handicapped Persons in Region I

LEADER: JAMES DUMPSON
Dean, School of Social Work
Fordham University, New York City

Lord Jeffery Inn
Amherst, Mass. April 19-21, 1967

Sponsored by
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND
15 West 16th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011

ED022281

CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.	Program.....	1
2.	Keynote Address - "A TIME OF CHANGE - A CHALLENGE TO ADMINISTRATORS" James Dumpson.....	4
3.	The Government's Role in Service Provision.....	10
4.	THE GAP IN OUR SERVICES - A Government Responsibility Eleanor Smith.....	12
5.	Voluntarism - Service Provision.....	18
6.	Problem Solving - A Board and Executive Responsibility.....	23
	Implications for Administrative Practice.....	27

Appendix

A.	Planning Committee.....	30
B.	List of Participants.....	31

PROGRAM

NORTHEASTERN ADMINISTRATIVE INSTITUTE

The Lord Jeffery, Amherst, Mass.
April 19-21, 1967

Theme: THE CHANGING AMERICAN SCENE: As It Relates to Health, Education and Welfare Services for Visually Handicapped

Institute Leader: Mr. James Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Work, Fordham University, New York City

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1967

5:30 - 6:30 PM - Registration and Social Hour

8:00 - 9:00 PM - Introduction - A. Marie Morrison, ACSW, Regional Consultant, American Foundation for the Blind

An Overview of the Changing American Scene for Social Welfare - Mr. Dumpson

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1967

9:30 - 10:30 AM - The Government's Role in Service Provision - Mr. Dumpson

10:30 - 10:45 AM - Coffee

10:45 - 12:00 AM - New Legislation and Its Impact on the Governmental-Voluntary Agency Relationship - Mr. A. Ryrie Koch, Regional Assistant Commissioner, Department of Health, Education and Welfare Region I

12:00 - 2:00 PM - Lunch

2:00 - 3:30 PM - Voluntarism in Service Provision - Mr. Dumpson

3:30 - 3:45 PM - Coffee

3:45 - 4:30 PM - Identifying Problem Areas for Executives and Boards - A Group Discussion led by Mr. Dumpson and Mr. Koch

FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1967

9:00 - 10:00 AM - Problem Solving - A Board and Executive Responsibility - Mr. Dumpson

10:00 - 10:15 AM - Coffee

10:15 - 12:00 - Implications for Administrative Practice - Mr. Dumpson

12:00 noon - Adjournment

THE CHANGING AMERICAN SCENE

As It Relates to Health, Education and Welfare Services for Visually Handicapped

8:00 PM- April 19, 1967

Chairman- Owen Pollard
Leader- James Dumpson
Recorder- Marie Morrison

Miss Morrison welcomed the group to the Administrative Institute. She expressed appreciation to the Program Planning Committee for its fine work in planning the Institute. Mr. Owen Pollard Chairman of the Planning Committee, was then introduced.

Mr. Pollard introduced each member of the Planning Committee and expressed his appreciation to them and to the American Foundation for the Blind for making this Institute possible. He asked Mrs. Doris Sausser, Director of the Community Services Division, American Foundation for the Blind to introduce the Institute leader.

Mrs. Sausser announced that this was the second Administrative Institute which AFB has sponsored in the Northeastern Region. She expressed appreciation to Mr. Dumpson who had agreed to provide the leadership for this Institute. He had been the unanimous choice of the Planning Committee. Mr. James Dumpson is the Dean of the School of Social Work at Fordham University. He has held many important positions in the field of Social Welfare including being the Commissioner of the New York City Welfare Department. He has served on many national committees in this country and as consultant to several foreign governments. He has written several books and articles and collaborated on many others, on various aspects of social welfare.

Executive Development Institute, American Foundation for the Blind

"A TIME OF CHANGE - A CHALLENGE TO ADMINISTRATORS"

James R. Dumpson, Dean

Fordham University School of Social Service

"A Time of Change - A Challenge to Administrators" the title I have selected for my opening statement uses terms that have come almost to be cliches. They are terms that we use every day and too frequently mean not only different things to different people, but far too often they have conflicting meaning to the same people in their several roles. We all accept that change, like natural law is inevitable and inescapable and even though change is usually painful, we accommodate to it and overlook its real meaning, what is new as a result of it, and what is our opportunity and responsibility to direct its course. Some change effect us only in our roles as parents, as members of a family. Others, affect us as workers, others as users of a variety of institutions beyond the family and the services they provide. But all too rarely do we associate challenge to change in whatever role we are functioning.

Like the word change, challenge too is overworked in our everyday vocabulary. Of all the definitions I find in the dictionary for the word challenge, I like the one that identifies it with the call to exercise skill, strength, and knowledge. For me, this suggests a confrontation with whatever is different and a use of past experiences, insights, skills and strengths to use and direct that which is different towards identifiable goals. It is within this context that I approached consideration of this statement for this evening. I asked myself, and I ask you - what changes can we identify that present a challenge to those of us who are board members, agency executives and workers, and citizens as we direct our experience, knowledge, skills and strengths toward the social purpose of all our efforts. What is different, in process or already accomplished that has relevance to us committed to freeing individuals and groups who are blind or visually handicapped to achieve maximum fulfillment? And as I speak those words of your social purpose, even though we tend ofttimes to leave their meaning vague, I remember that the values that underlie our purpose are rooted in our Judeo-Christian heritage. This fact should help us gain a measure of specificity.

I have selected for consideration a fundamental change in our thinking and practice that we tend not to identify as basic to much of the movement and development in social welfare programming and practice. We fail to factor out this underlying philosophical stance we have adopted because, when we identify it, we are a bit uncomfortable with it for a variety of reasons. But I wish to identify it, or really restate it here this evening because I believe only as we do identify it and come to terms with it, in our roles as board and staff will we be able to influence its implementation in positive constructive terms. Only then can we use our experiences, insights, knowledge, and skill in directing

the course it shall take toward our basic social purpose. When we do that, I suggest that the words "change" and "challenge" take on real meaning.

The change to which I would address your attention is the acceptance and broadening implementation of the concept of the welfare state. I know the term evokes all kinds of negative responses for many. The core of the concept of the welfare state, for me, is nothing more than the utilization by government of all its social, economic, and political resources for complete human well-being - the realization of the social purpose of a democratic society; the assumption of responsibility by government for what happens to all of its people.

Recently in New York State, we experienced a dramatic manifestation of this principle at work. What really was paramount in the battle concerning eligibility for medicaid was the degree to which government should use its resources for the assurance of adequate health standards for the greatest number of people in New York - not in terms of the traditional, pauperizing levels of indigency, but in terms of the value we assign to an optimum state of health for our citizenry and the use of government's resources, contributed to by all of the people, for the broadest possible range of physical well-being of the population. What was called into question, under a variety of guises was the extent to which government shall use its resources - in this instance its economic resource - to assure a fundamental aspect of human well-being. The decision of the State Board of Social Welfare, supported against great political odds by the Governor, was one of a number of similar answers that are yet to come in the implementations of this evolving policy posture as we seek the well-being of all of our people.

The War on Poverty, now reduced by the Congress to little more than a national fracas, can yet be another dramatic and constructive manifestation of governmental assumption of responsibility for what happens to its people. It can yet become an occasion for government to utilize its economic and social and political resources in providing a wide range of exits from poverty for those caught in its grips, and so give to the poverty-stricken the boots with straps on them so they can with substantial material help, opportunity, and encouragement really pull themselves up by their own boot-straps.

Voluntary social welfare agencies have long considered themselves the traditional fighters of poverty. Whether they have been <u>the</u> fighters and whether they have succeeded or, indeed if they were <u>the</u> fighters whether they could have succeeded, are not the important questions. What is important is that government, by national policy has determined to use its resources - social, economic, and political for the well-being of that 20% of its citizens who have been denied access to the dividends of the national affluence. The Economic Opportunity Act is not perfect. Congress, by its actions in the last session, and maybe even more so in this session, has turned a war against poverty into little more than a disorderly noise around the unmet needs of the poverty-stricken. But the policy has been established. We have nationally the political machinery available to us to amend, improve, and expend the Economic Opportunity Act to suit whatever is required

for implementation of the national policy. We have the tools available to mandate the Congress to authorize and appropriate the funds required to make the fullest use of the change that is our challenge.

One need only review the long list of enactment of social provisions by the Congress to gain support of the thesis that there is change in government's perception of its role and our growing acceptance of government's relationship to and responsibility for its people.

This change of government relationship to its people carries with it, I believe, a complementary change in perception of people who need a variety of services, it carries with it an enlarging understanding of the breadth and comprehensiveness of social need. We note, for example, clear understanding of the fact that the total context of American society must change as we have been forced to focus on the urgent necessity of bringing the Negro into full citizenship. But, the struggle for civil rights for the Negro has underscored the essential importance of human rights for <u>all</u> of our people - the policy that affirms that every individual in our society is valued and that not one shall be deprived or rejected or denied full access to every opportunity available to American society because of race or color, his economic status, his cultural background or the nature of his need. Full implementation of this affirmation of policy is yet to be achieved. But there is growing acknowledgement that a number of strategies will have to be employed including a redistribution of our income resources and a redistribution of our opportunity resources. Both of these redistribution strategies hold significant implications to voluntary agencies. As we confront the change in understanding and attitude implicit in what I am saying, let us be clear that, like the natural law, these trends cannot be reversed. The challenge we face is how to use our ingights, knowledge and our will to direct the trends constructively in terms of our national purpose.

It is within the context of our deeper understanding of the potentials of even our most underprivileged and denied, and the new meaning that we have given to human dignity and self-respect that we now proclaim, in words at least, the principle of maximum feasible participation of those we seek to serve. Undoubtedly one of the great contributions of the Economic Opportunity Act and of its administrators at the Federal level until quite recently, has been the requirement that the poor and the consumers of services - those who are the target of its program - must be involved in the development and administration of those programs. Many of us in the voluntary social welfare sector really have not accepted the far-reaching implications of this principle. It asserts, I believe, a changing perception of people - those we seek to serve, and of ourselves as helpers. I suggest that we not be misled by believing that this is an old, old principle put in a new guise. Far from it. Traditionally, we have approached people with a sort of over-under orientation; we in our great wisdom, with our expert professional skill, and sincere commitment knew what was best; we were justified, therefore, to hold a superior stance in our relationship to those in need of help. We developed a rationale that said that those in need had little to contribute to the solution of their or any other social problem. Indeed, the rationale went on to assert that if they were competent to contribute to problem solution they would not be in need in the first place. But we are faced now

with departure from these client-system oriented programs. In the war against poverty and among voluntary agencies that are part of it, people are being seen as having a right to participate in the planning and determination of programs and services using public funds as do other people in the community; as consumers they have a role in determining how the services should be given; and they like all people have a need which they must be given for opportunities to serve and contribute.

The enunciation of these principles initially have been related to the war against poverty under the Economic Opportunity Act. But now, they are being pressed to other governmental services. Public welfare is challenged to find ways to accommodate its practice to this change of perception of the recipients of its services. How will the voluntary sector meet this challenge to change as it confronts the imperative to give up its traditional client-oriented system of help.

Permit me to add one final observation of change. This, too, has been crystallized into a statement of principle for public welfare. The Advisory Council on Public Welfare, in a recent report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare proclaimed its belief in (a) the universal availability of services; (b) the easy accessibility to services; and (c) to the legal entitlement or right to services of all people who need and choose to use them. Underscored in these statements effecting the delivery of services is the essential need for adequate income available to all. I read into these proclamations basic changes in our concept of services and how they shall be universally available to people. I suggest, first, that a new definition of services is called for if we are to be committed to universal availability. We are no longer talking about services for the poor or underprivileged. Universal availability carries with it the social utility new-services that are required for enriched living, for personal well-being in our modern-day technological society. They are services required by all people, not limited by the wish of the provider, status or diagnosis of the recipient. If they are to be easily accessible, we shall have to reorganize our delivery pattern. Decentralization of our services to the neighborhood level with the assured participation of those to be served in the nature of those services will be required. We are subscribing, it seems to me to adapting our services to the needs and preferences of the users. And if entitlement means anything, it means that the right to services is buttressed by a defined right to appeal and a guarantee of the equitable distribution of the services available.

These are but a few of the changes that I find implicit in the report of the Advisory Council entitled "Having the Power, We Have the Duty." Change? Yes? Challenge. I believe they are inescapable not only to public welfare and the government that supports and administers public welfare; they have profound implications for all of social welfare - public and voluntary alike.

Let me now propose for your consideration a number of implications - the challenges if you will - to you as board and staff members the

changes I have identified.

THE IMPLICATIONS
(Expanded as presented)

1. The challenge to voluntary agencies to improve the know-how and facility in influencing public social policies that effect the well-being of individuals, groups, and communities.
2. The challenge to voluntary agencies is whether they can shift priority emphasis from problem solving strategy of our traditional priority method in social work to a social change strategy that gives equal emphasis to community organization skills focusing on institutional change, sound social policy development, and the elimination of these social and economic policies practices that contribute heavily to individual malfunctioning, dependency, and social disorganization. Change in the environment in which people live needs to have the same emphasis in agency practice and use of resources as emphasis now given to phychic functioning of the individual. I suggest that each voluntary agency redefine its function to include an advocacy role in behalf of those whom it is established to serve.
3. Voluntary agencies, not unlike government agencies, must develop strategies in their organization and administration that makes meaningful the principle of "maximum feasible" participation of the consumers of their services. This means boards that are more representative of the area and population served. It means that staff develop skills for involving those who come to the agency for help in determining the nature of services to be provided and the manner in which those services are provided.
4. If my thesis is sound that we are in the midst of change in the degree and nature of government assumption of responsibility for the well-being of all people, we are challenged to find a new pattern of relationship between government and voluntarism. A more aggressive leadership role in identifying gaps in services and social provisions is required. A new model for financing voluntary agency services is indicated. Contractual arrangements between government and voluntary agencies for blocs of services for <u>all</u> people, indeed for large geographic areas are suggested with accountability as to standards and quality of services being a public responsibility. Political activity, but not partisan politics will need to be part of agency policy and practice.
5. Inventive ways must be found to meet the manpower crisis in social welfare if universal availability of services is to be assured. A new definition of social worker is emerging that includes use of a variety of levels of skill and understanding to function at a variety of levels of service provision. I view the social worker required to meet the challenge of practice as including those without college degrees, those with college degrees, the M.S.W., and those with post-graduate training. Agencies must meet the challenge of appropriately utilizing the skills of these various levels if they are to meet the changes required by universal availability of services.

The training of this broad range of personnel skills opens up a new relationship with social work education and related disciplines. It also raises question as to how social work education relates to agencies in helping them change in practice to meet the new needs and how agencies feed back into social work education at all levels the experiences they have in the new concept of social service, social change strategies, and involvement of the consumers of services that has relevance to social work education.

These are some of the changes I see on the scene that have immediate relevance to agencies such as you represent. Whether you accept these changes as the significant ones is not as important as the urgency of your recognizing that there are pervasive changes on the American welfare scene. What is important is your readiness, your willingness, your ability to relate to change - indeed to change as a board, as an executive, as a practitioner to meet a changing scene - government's new role in service provision and your relationship to it, the new perception of the consumers of services and their role, and new requirements in service delivery patterns. Either we change to meet the new or we ourselves in the voluntary sector will spell the doom of voluntarism in America. The question I leave and the one that will run through this seminar is whether and how you can meet the challenge of change.

The Government's Role in Service Provision
9:30-10:30 AM- April 20, 1967

Chairman- Wesley Sprague
Leader- James Dumpson
Recorder- Virginia Cole

Having established at the evening meeting that change in the role of government has produced challenge, the morning discussion, led by Mr. Dumpson, was focused on the challenge of partnership between government and voluntary agencies.

Questions such as the following were efficiently handled by Mr. James Dumpson and by group discussion:

> If we assume that the government takes the lead in the financial Role, what place is there for voluntarism?
> If the government brings in regimentation, control, regulation, won't the voluntary sector lose its enthusiasm?
> If the consumers of service are to be included as policy makers, who should represent blind people?
> In this welfare state in 10 or 15 years, won't the government be telling us exactly HOW we are going to perform our services?
> How are we to cope with the problem of manpower in meeting government standards? Are we competing against each other?

The fears implicit or explicit expressed in these questions are unfounded. "Control" must imply a shared responsibility. A term preferable to control is accountability. If there is a real partnership there is no implication of "control." Government must however assure that services for which it pays are not substandard or destructive. Government seeks a clear cut contractual basis to purchase services which have been prescribed. Standards for these services must be developed in partnership. The more people involved in building these standards, the greater their acceptance. The know-how and experience of the voluntary sector is important in developing standards. Accountability also connotes that public tax funds used to purchase services from voluntary resource must not be misused lest voluntary giving be discouraged and reduced.

The word partnership connotes equality. To counterbalance the government's assets of money, legality and social responsibility the voluntary sector must share by means of program development toward the greatest benefit to the recipient. The voluntary agency cannot rely on the misconception that it is a "100% voluntary private organization" and may therefore stay outside the mainstream. The fact is all voluntary agencies make use of public funds through their tax exemption. Government funds should pay for the full cost of a service less whatever the voluntary agency has raised for that particular service.

The "Welfare State" is merely a redistribution of opportunity and of

income. As long as we are in a democratic society there is no distinction between the people and the government. "Government" will do whatever we want it to do. We helped make the government and there is no need to feel suspicious or fearful about its activities. It is a government which we have established for our protection. We can if we wish change the Health and Welfare field of this government. In some fields without government there would be no services for people because voluntary agencies have abdicated their responsibility.

To meet the manpower gap we need innovative ways of using personnel. Use of present professional staff can be made more optimum by pulling out parts of jobs which can be done by less trained persons. The very people we are serving can be employed for case finding, and for escort and clerical type work. We will never be able to find enough persons with Master of Social Work degrees. We must also take a critical look at the supervisory hierarchy and counteract the forced dependency of the worker upon the supervisor. Increased training facilities both formal and informal are needed. The quality of the service should have as much emphasis as the professionalism of the staff.

There must be joint planning between agencies, not only between voluntary and government agencies for the blind, but also between both types of agencies for the blind and other service agencies not specifically for the blind. A federation of agencies could structure complementary services and agree upon innovative responsibilities.

THE GAP IN OUR SERVICES - A GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY?

Miss Eleanor Smith, Assistant Regional Representative

10:45-12:00- April 20, 1967

I am pleased to be with you today, even in the role of a substitute for Mr. Koch, the Regional Assistant Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, in Region I. I hope I can bring to you the interest that all of us in Vocational Rehabilitation Administration have in the provision of quality service to the blind and visually impaired. The new legislation for Vocational Rehabilitation came about because there were gaps in services to all disabled, including the blind. These services are not the responsibility of the State Public Agency or the private agency or the Federal Government. They are the responsibility of all of us collectively.

You may recall that on January 7, 1965, President Johnson sent a message to Congress "Advancing the Nation's Health." This was broad and made many recommendations for improving all aspects of the national health picture. It is my understanding that it was the first major Presidential message to Congress in which Vocational Rehabilitation was specifically mentioned. In that message, the President advised Congress that legislation was needed to achieve " a new life for the disabled." An administration bill was sent to Congress shortly thereafter and that was the beginning of the final push which resulted in P.L. 333 of the 89th Congress.

I believe the conclusion of the President's message expresses what I feel is the real significance of our Vocational Rehabilitation amendments.

> "I believe we have come to a rare moment of opportunity and challenge, in the evolution of our society. In the message I have presented to you -- and in other messages I shall be sending -- my purpose is to outline the attainable horizons of a greater society which a confident and prudent people can begin to build for the future.
>
> "Whatever we aspire to do together, our success in those enterprises -- and our enjoyment of the fruits that result -- will rest finally upon the health of our people. We cannot and we will not overcome all the barriers -- or surmount all the obstacles -- in one effort, no matter how intensive. But --------- we are already behind our capability and our potential. Further delay will only compound our problems and deny our people the health and happiness that could be theirs."

I frequently think how lucky I am that I am in a position that is a kind of link between the national scene - the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and such national associations as the American Foundation

for the Blind - the State and local public agencies and the voluntary non-profit agencies. We have some fascinating contacts with people on the firing line and with the researchers and the trainers of professionals. Yet, there are still many services to be identified and evaluated and problems to be researched. I think all in this room will agree there is a gap, perhaps many gaps, in our services to the blind. One of the major questions is, "Whose responsibility is it to close the gap?" We hear the words "creative Federalism" which means in brief that the Federal Government is in a healthy partnership with State governments. John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said this is only part of the picture. The concept has implications for the whole non-Federal sector, including local government and the private sector. He goes on to say, "Voluntary associations provide a significant means of harnessing non-government resources toward a public purpose ---."

I always hesitate when I am talking to any group about the government resources available to do the job that we know must be done, that the audience will look upon the government in general, and Vocational Rehabilitation Administration in particular, as simply the place from which the money flows. We try to make clear in all our contacts that government has a more comprehensive role to play; that sometimes we have to say "NO" not because there are no funds but because we honestly believe that the proposed research project, the suggested training program, or the establishment of a facility is not in the best interests of larger goals. Sometimes, however, they are not possible within our legal framework. I believe this is one of the real problems we have in determining the gaps in services for the blind and whose responsibility it is to meet them. All agencies for the blind have services which cannot be funded with Vocational Rehabilitation Administration funds although they may be rehabilitation services, in the broadest sense of those words and this can cause misunderstanding. Often, our decisions are made because a proposal is not clear - lack of communication is often one of the causes of a gap in service. This can happen between the local public and private agency, too. So first I would say that this gap is not a government responsibility; it is the responsibility of each of us to be sure that we understand each other and do not react with suspicion to each new proposal that is presented for consideration or each negative decision that is made. Secondly, we know there is a gap in the services which are promptly available to all the blind who need vocational rehabilitation. (I am not going to try to identify gaps in all the services to the blind since that would be presumptuous of me.) When we know that in the year ending June 30, 1966, in the New England, New York, and New Jersey State agencies for the blind, 40 percent of the referrals that had been carried over from the previous year or had been received during the twelve months immediately prior to June 30, 1966, had not had a decision as to eligibility or ineligibility for vocational rehabilitation services, we immediately recognize that there is a gap. The immediate reaction of people who are not in the State agency for the blind, I am sure, is "How Awful." "Why don't they take care of these cases." Or they nod their heads wisely and say "I know; I referred a case and nobody did anything for two months." But I ask, "How many times have the board members

and directors of agencies which serve the blind or refer blind people to the State agency, sat down with the State Director to find out if he needs support with his budget or with his attempts to break through the ceiling on staff or to join a united front in the development of new facilities?" I don't think it is entirely the responsibility of government. It is the responsibility of everyone who is interested in prompter services to the blind. This figure applies only to those persons who have come to the attention of the agency and does not include those who may have needs but have not been referred.

I cannot omit some reference to funds. Most of you know, I am sure, that the Federal Government under the new amendments now meets 75 percent of the expenditures for vocational rehabilitation services and the State puts up 25 percent. The purpose of this increase as of July 1, 1966, was not for State funds to "dry up" or be reduced, but was to make it possible to expand the State programs. Few States are using the full allotment of Federal money that would be available to them if they had State Matching money. The Federal Government has a responsibility to let the States know what is available in the way of funds and to provide enough money so a decent job can be done. State agencies have a responsibility to have a plan of action and to "cost" this out; and private agencies have a responsibility to "feed-in" to the public agencies the needs which they see in the community which are not being met.

We are living in a time when there are many possibilities for trying some innovations and expansions of our conventional programs. There are funds available for projects of this kind but there is also a price tag on these. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration pays only part of the cost of these projects. However, a small local or State contribution can often make it possible to test out whether a new service is really needed, will be utilized, and should be part of a larger on-going program. These funds are available not only to public agencies for vocational rehabilitation purposes but to private voluntary agencies. I mentioned that there is a price tag on these projects since Vocational Rehabilitation Administration pays only part of the cost. The old saying that "It isn't the initial cost but the upkeep you have to worry about" is most apropos here. Most of our projects are demonstration or service programs. They differ from pure research where you look for something and prove or disprove it - then spend the rest of your life writing articles about it and presenting papers at conferences when the program committee is searching for a speaker to fill a slot. Many of the new authorities under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act are to get new programs started - construction of Rehabilitation Facilities and Workshops, three-year projects for expansion or for workshop improvement. Who will finance these when the period of Federal support is over? As I listened last night, on the lower level, to a discussion of the problems faced by agencies in Community Chests, I knew this problem was a very real one, but it is not insurmountable. Public agencies can pay fees for services but this too requires understanding, quality services and a good hard look at what services are needed and will be utilized. The avenues to utilization of services often have the biggest potholes of all.

One of the very important activities that is being conducted in all the States, as a result of the new amendments is the State-wide Planning for Vocational Rehabilitation. I hope that all of you who are in work concerned with the blind will assure that this disability group is given proper attention in your State. In all States in New England, except Connecticut, this planning is being carried out by special commissions appointed by the Governor. In Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, the planning is being done by special staff within the Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. There will be many opportunities in the next few months for citizens and voluntary agencies to participate in these planning activities. There will be task forces and committees and public hearings. You are the ones who often know the legislative barriers standing in the way of public services for all eligible people. You are the ones who often most clearly see the people who need services from public agencies but do not receive them because of some restrictive interpretation of law or regulation or because of lack of funds. I do not know how many of you were involved in similar State-wide Planning for Mental Retardation and Mental Health. Some realistic, challenging proposals grew out of those planning efforts and we hope that the same thing will occur for Vocational Rehabilitation through our planning. The goal is a blueprint for providing by 1975 or sooner Vocational Rehabilitation to all disabled persons who can benefit from those services. Also the State-wide Planning for Facilities and Workshops is an important area for participation. When these planning activities are completed and implemented, we hope many of the existing gaps in services will disappear. We are promoting undergraduate education in the helping services started in WICHE - Workshop in May (aide vs. on to graduate training) Trend - as one can see from pamphlet issued by council on Social Workers Education. This is one of our efforts to meet the manpower crisis, to which Mr. Dumpson referred last night. I have nightmares sometimes when I think how ill-prepared we are right now for this trend, we haven't broken down the professional jobs so we know what these Aid to Blind can really do in the way of quality services. We've had them for years in our public programs because States wouldn't pay enough to get trained people. So we have unfairly asked them to do a complex job including all the functions which only a professionally trained person should be asked to do. I'd like to see some experimentation and innovative projects tried in different settings in this area of administration.

I believe I can end this presentation in no better way than by quoting for you some words of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner whom I quoted at the beginning. He seems to be able to put things in perspective. These words were in a speech he made in January, 1967:

> "Take my word for it, whatever impression you may get from reading the papers or from observing the antics of some of our fellow citizens, millions of Americans are doers and not talkers only, millions live by the American commitment and live to further that commitment.
>
> "I believe that we are living through a creative moment in our history today. Creative times are not comfortable times.

These are times when we are acutely aware of our problems -- so much so that people who are naturally melancholy or pessimistic or easily defeated find it almost more than they can bear. But I can't think that we were better off when we were less aware of our problems.

"Let me expand that. Never before in the history of this Nation have we been more conscious of the needs of the disadvantaged segments of our population. We have the feeling that the problem is getting graver by the minute and we read searing indictments by social critics who share this generally heightened awareness.

"But the problem isn't getting worse and we're not more guilty than we were 20 years ago or 50 years ago when we were very much less conscious of these problems. In fact, we are better off if only for the reason that problems brought to the surface and argued about are less malignant than those that are suppressed or ignored.

"We're not only acutely aware of our problems, we are trying to do something about them. I would emphasize the word 'trying.' Life was never a series of easy victories, not even a series of hard victories. We can't win every round. But driving, creative effort to solve problems is the breath of life for a civilization as for an individual. We won't solve every problem, but if we ever stop trying, we are licked."

Notes on Discussion Following Paper by Eleanor Smith

Virginia Cole- Recorder

The discussion lead off around the subject of grants and research projects with questions such as?

> Why must projects be approved by the local VR agency?
> Must the applicant always go through the State agency?
> What is the procedure for this and is there any appeal procedure?
> Isn't there a fear that the established agencies will scoop up all the Federal dollars?
> How can we get manpower for a project that does not continue beyond 2-3 years?

For Research projects a direct line to Washington is possible and these do not require approval by the State Agency but they must have been reviewed by the State Agency. Other types of grants applied for by voluntary agencies must be approved by the State Agency. There is no official way of taking appeal action, but a rationale of cooperation from the start would tend to prevent trouble for the project. Cooperation can also assist those less sophisticated about "grantism." Federal money does not come from a bottomless barrel. To put it to best use long range comprehensive planning is needed. Good communication is needed -- the ability to sit down and talk together and plan at the start for continuation after the grant period is ended.

Mr. Dumpson pointed out that involvement of the lay group is important for planning from the start to take over the project. The fact of the 75%-25% ratio gives control to the government but at the same time requires citizen involvement. If quality services are already available through the private agency such services should be purchased by the government agency but this must not block development of services for others who are not served by the private agency. Private agency boards are often prestige people who can and should support budget requests of the public agencies. Social action or legislative committees are often lacking in voluntary agencies but are needed to be alert to development possibilities. For example, HR 5710 which provides money for training at graduate and undergraduate level should be studied and supported.

VOLUNTARISM - SERVICE PROVISION
2:00-3:30 PM- April 20, 1967

Session Chairman- Oscar Friedenson
Discussion Leader- James Dumpson
Recorder- Helen Worden

Mr. Dumpson opened the session after preliminary remarks by Mr. Friedenson with reference to the Ford Foundation Report of 1965, referring to its findings that between 1929-1959, public philanthropy had increased ten-fold to 50 billion dollars, or, more than 10% of the gross national product. Private philanthropy had risen to 10 billion dollars, or, about 2% of the gross national product.

In the early part of the afternoon session, Mr. Dumpson raised the following questions on VOLUNTARISM:

1. Who is the agency serving? Whom should it serve?
2. How is the Voluntary Agency relating to governmental programs?
3. Is and should the Voluntary Agency be coming to grips with basic social issues and problems; i.e. Social Legislation, Income Maintenance, Housing, and Discrimination?
4. How is it working with other organizations, professions, and disciplines?
5. How should it continue to be financed?
6. How should it involve a broader base of participation and support?

He then went on to give the following suggestions for Voluntary direction:

1. Consideration should be given to community dimensions of a particular problem of mutual concern to both the public and private sector. They should work together, making provision for services to those who need it; together in identifying the problem; together in measuring its nature and extent; together in evaluating the impact; and together in experimenting with new approaches.
2. Citizen participation and activity within public programs should be assured.
3. Voluntary Agencies should recover from over-specification resulting in a narrow approach to basic social problems; they should think in terms of multi-service around people's needs, rather than around a diagnostic entity.
4. Social change should be of concern. They should take the advocacy role re: legislation and through dialogue with others.
5. Voluntary Agencies should re-evaluate their functions in

terms of changing needs, as well as changes in social organizations for meeting these needs. If an agency seeks to be financed wholly or in part by tax funds, it should guard against loss of the flexibility and selectivity that characterizes Voluntarism.

6. They should transfer services to the public sector when indicated, thus, leaving the Voluntary Agency free to do what only it can do or can do best.

He ended this portion of his remarks by quoting Secretary Gardner's statement, "The only stability today is stability in motion."

A question was raised: Should we also talk about transfer of certain services to other appropriate Voluntary Agencies?

One answer was that duplication of services is a luxury. Another participant felt that clients should have the right to shop for the best service; however, the shopping should be among generic agencies, as well as those agencies that deal only with problems of blindness. It was stated that we have a role to see that the generic agency is educated in dealing with persons with visual problems. Mr. Dumpson indicated that this was an encouraging statement to hear. It was further noted that fragmentation of services has more defects than positiveness. Leadership can come from the top down, that is, from the Federal through the various stages to the local. Dean Dumpson said that this is now going on in the group working with the aging, which has resulted from pressures brought by the agencies dealing with the problem. Dean Dumpson is not sure leadership should come from agencies such as those represented here. It was remarked that there has to be a centralization of agencies serving the handicapped. Time is one of the things we are struggling with; and Boards should be made aware of these needs.

Mr. Friedenson noted that up to now we have been talking about the kinds of services people need and how we meet them. All of our services are a response to emergencies in our society. He asked: Should not the Voluntary Agency be working to prevent these emergencies?

He referred to the Hurlin Report to verify this statement. He noted that agencies should have social action programs dealing with eliminating the issues which cause the problem. Voluntary Agencies should move into preventative work, rather than deal with just the problem of blindness. There needs to be a correlation by the agencies that are dealing with problems in all areas of service (an interlocking of action between those dealing with mental retardation, blindness, etc.). These things cannot be mandated. The Voluntary Agencies have a responsibility to come to grips with social problems. Dean Dumpson remarked that we lose a vast reservoir of Board people, because of our pre-occupation with housekeeping agency problems, rather than involving them in broader issues.

Mrs. Sausser asked: Does this bring up the question of how small

an agency can be and still be effective? Dean Dumpson replied that an agency can be too small, regardless of the need existing, and it may mean a merger is feasible to broaden expertise. One of the participants remarked that if we give up what people, i.e. those who established the agency, gave us to do, or provided for us to do, there would be screams. Dean Dumpson said O.K., these screams may be long overdue. The duty to initiate lies with the executive. If the executive prepares the Board and community properly, there need not be these screams. An educational job needs to be done. Agencies should also listen to client screams and give them a say. Dean Dumpson continued relative to representation of clients on the Board that it was dangerous to have on the Board a formal representative of a group you serve. However, there should be on the Board, on a client level, persons who need your services. Selection should be made on the basis of the typical person you serve and his insight and experience concerning the services the agency renders. This is what is desirable.

The question was raised: Should a client have a choice of where he should go for service? Can we support the luxury of this?

The statement was then made that there should be no duplication. Dean Dumpson remarked that in certain instances a client should have a choice, i.e. going to a sectarian versus a public agency for service, but not the same service from two equal servicing agencies. This, he said, involves comprehensive community planning.

The next question was: Who decides what community planning agencies should do?

There was a variety of answers. Dean Dumpson feels that there is something that we as agencies can do about this, even though the manner in which the decisions are made are not now as we would like them. Dean Dumpson went on to say that he hopes this Institute will raise our sights so we will plan for the needed change. Planning Council leadership can be developed. Agencies can refuse to support, or can politic to get their Board Members on the Planning Council decision making board. He finished by stating that it takes a long time to effect change, but it can be done. The group then recessed for ten minutes.

3:45 PM-4:30 PM

<u>Problem Areas for Executives and Boards.</u>

This was to be a group discussion, led by Mr. Dumpson and Miss Smith. Mr. Friedenson asked the group to think about areas about which there was concern on the part of participants on whatever level they served in the agency. He then gave an opportunity to each participant around the table to express their various views. Among the concerns indicated were the following:

1. A Board Member asked for information on confidentiality.
2. Another Board Member was concerned that in selecting Board Members, more consideration is not given to the

areas in which the Board Member is qualified and desires to serve, even though this area is or may not be the one related to his profession. For him it was a "breath of fresh air" to be working in the field of Finances, and yet, be serving on a board committee in an area concerned with service programs for the blind; an area in which he is vitally interested but not as knowledgeable.

3. An Executive said his major problem is financing. Deficit financing was generally the problem situation with his agency.
4. Another Executive's problem revolves around the fact that this agency is a branch of a larger agency, and, except for a very brief meeting with the Board, it feels as if it is in limbo.
5. The problem of trying to learn all about the competencies or even weaknesses of people on the Board, plus getting Board Members interested in the philosophy of the agency along with the social impacts they must meet as Board Members, concerned this Executive.
6. Uncertainty as to the value of an advisory committee was the concern of a public agency Executive.
7. The problem of knowing the qualifications for Board Membership and the proper functions of the Board bothered this individual.
8. This agency has no real Board which proves to be a problem for the administrative staff.
9. Another problem is that of being swamped by a proliferation of material, but a lack of communication among the proliferation. The Executive was annoyed by the number of questionnaires seeking information.
10. This participant was concerned about communication among and between agencies and the need for greater liaison.
11. The problem of knowing the role the agency plays in the kaleidoscope of agencies in the community was expressed.
12. This person noted the problem of finding ways of extending services when need is recognized and of getting authorization to do so from the agency board and in some instances from the community.
13. A Public Agency Executive expressed concern about the problem of being able to conform with the COMSTAC REPORT on standards concerning Board rotation, in light of the fact that the makeup of the Board in a Public Agency is mandated by law.
14. The problem revolving around getting communication among and between Board, staff, etc., was cited.
15. How to determine whether to continue to provide the kinds of service now being given, and whether there should be movement into other areas of service was of concern.
16. The problems which have arisen, dealing with radical changes in Board structure, are causing confusion.
17. This participant claimed to have no problems, because every member on the Board was on a committee.
18. The nature of the people to be served by this agency was either the very young or the very old, and the fact that there were

two such extremes caused problems in providing service.

19. This Board Member wishes to know more about what the agency he represents is doing.
20. This person saw his problem as revolving around giving service in a rural state. Among these were the identification of the blind population, their needs, plus the problem of communication with Public Agencies. The latter problem exists, even though there are inter-agency meetings every two months and Executives meet every month.
21. This Board Member said their agency has a thinking and working Executive. It is also a "working" Board and likes it; the agency has no problems with its Executive.
22. This Executive felt that we are operating in fast-moving times in terms of work with blind persons, and the field of Social Service in general. It was felt that it was the executive's duty to keep the Board informed. Concern was expressed as to how this can best be done so that the Board can receive a maximum amount of information in order to use the competency of its members to an optimum degree, taking into account the desire and amount of involvement the Board Member can or wishes to contribute.
23. This Board Agency Executive has an advisory Board of thirty (30), and finds it difficult to define the specific functions of a Board Member and to give guidance.
24. The problems of staffing was seen as a problem.
25. Several participants said that they had no problems.

Since the entire group of participants had been polled at this point, the session was adjourned.

Problem Solving - A Board and Executive Responsibility
Implications for Administrative Practice
9:00-10:00 AM- April 21, 1967

Chairman- Helen Worden
Leader- James Dumpson
Recorder- Wesley Sprague

Mrs. Helen Worden, Chairman of the morning session, introduced Mr. James Dumpson once again who immediately lead a discussion relative to points raised throughout the Institute, his personal observations and suggestions relative to areas of concern for board and administrative officers in the public and private social welfare field. Major emphasis was given to the following areas of concern.

I. Problem Identification

A. Problems identified by attendees (prior day) apparently were all "sweetness and light." The partnership between board and staff is contrary to this concept and to the findings of administrative theorists due to:

1. Board composition, i.e., usually dominant financially secure vs. the middle class background and professional experience of the administrative personnel.

a. Social welfare professions are still part of emerging professions and there is great difference in reference to the group, i.e., board and staff.

b. The basis of ideology or beliefs of the groups differ.

1) Board sees a different governmental role a more conservative vs. the humanistic more liberal identified ideal roles of the professionals.

2) Relationship of an employer to employee and over-under non-equal relationship.

B. Problems did not identify the true problems as determined by the real roles of board and staff.

1. The tendency of the executive to control that which the Board receives for decision making and discussion were not mentioned.

2. Executives too often relay solutions to problems which will be acceptable to him and which support his concept.

3. Some executives compound their problems by endeavoring to

reach or attain the role of the board member which is in reality unattainable leading to confusion, frustration, conflict-of-interest and no time to grasp his own true role and work in the best interest of the agency.

4. The board adopts, generally speaking, the role and points presented by the administration vs. setting its own policy since it is determined and recommended by the staff executive.

   a. The executive in reality is a <u>filter</u> to make sure policy or interpretation of it to the staff is as he alone desires. Therefore, the executive determines policy as he sees it.

5. The normal strains between board and staff did not come out due to the screening out or filtering out of the ideological areas with which we as board and staff should naturally be concerned.

II. Dean Dumpson's recommendations

A. Basic issues of social welfare should be brought to the attention and problems met by the board and executives of each agency. Consideration must be given by private agency persons to such public concerns as the handicapped, the public assistance, low-income housing, Vietnam War, guaranteed minimum income, etc.

B. Board too often becomes tied up with housekeeping minutiae, i.e., finances, statistics, program.

C. Board and staff must each carry a different role but be interrelated relative to behavioral attitudes and contributions of staff and board in order to bring about success in defined and fundamental goals of the agency.

OBSERVATIONS TO THE ABOVE

1. Meeting of the above type problems should be forced by the executive whose duty it is to inform the board who must see other than its own sheltered agency role. Board must have greater insight, more understanding and involvement in the total social welfare field.

2. Staff has not presented the above type conflicting roles due to:

   a. They believe it knows how the board stands,

   b. They have a reticence to bring in troublesome areas,

   c. They believe that the board would turn a deaf ear to

outside problems,

d. It must maintain a conventional approach.

3. It's the executive responsibility to provide environmental study groups whereby pros and cons of social welfare areas of concern might be presented for intelligent decision making by board and staff.

4. It's the executive responsibility to make sure that social welfare problems are made clear and shown to be not political, but vital to the clients whom we serve.

5. Board should know the alternatives to meeting certain social welfare problems and be so educated by the executive that intelligent decisions might be effected for the well-being of those with whom we are concerned.

III. Board responsibility, listed by Dean Dumpson

A. More involvement by board members in other than its own agency's area of concern is imperative. There is great need for interchange of board influences and opinions throughout the social welfare agencies of any local, state or federal community.

B. No change relative to the encroachment of public vs. voluntary roles can take place without an informed citizenry, knowledgeable of public opinion, action by citizens and board are citizens.

C. There should be representation on board of directors of the organized groups of citizens being served, i.e., clientele <u>represented</u>.*

D. Board should seek methods by which the natural built-in strains between board and staff can be alleviated.

E. Board should share with administration the responsibility for providing environment and correct time scheduling for presentation of social issues, i.e., opportunity for outside speakers study groups, subcommittees, institutes, etc. wherein board and staff might cooperate must be made available.

F. Board is responsible to the community and as a representative of the community must take to the community what it needs to effect intelligent decisions relative to the goals of the agency. It must act as a liaison to the community by action rather than by implication.

IV. Board Selectivity

A. Board members should be asked to serve due to experience and talents that might be made available to the organization.

1. It is important to ask a board member, however, where and how he wants to serve and to take cognizance of what is his need vs. the obvious transferral of his vocational persuits to the need of the association.

2. Avocational and vocational interests and persuits may not always be identical.

3. Focus should be as to how best he can contribute to the interests being served, the program being developed and the needs of the group being served.

4. Broad representative persons are required vs. the too frequent method of appointing those of certain racial, cultural, economic or educational basis factors which should not of themselves be the reasons for board appointment.

B. Board members should try to move into other interest areas and educate others relative to their experiences, i.e., board members should serve on more than one board in order to broaden their understanding and prospective of his initial social welfare agency concern.

*...ith ultimate responsibility for decision lying with board, clients should receive "maximum feasible opportunity to tell and observe." Such opportunity requires support, tact of selection of objective client and, naturally, is a slow tedious process before successful.

IMPLICATIONS FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE
10:15 AM-12:00- April 21, 1967

OBSERVATIONS BY DR. DUMPSON

I. There is no specific formula for administration due to its being a process involving a variety of levels of any community with many variables involved.

   A. Each administrator must relate to the problems of inter-action and interrelationships of people, and to the issues that directly or indirectly pertain to the goals and objectives of the agency involved.

      1. Administration must, therefore, remain a creative process, ever changing, ever inter-relating to people and principles.

      2. It must be an interacting process through control of the inter-relationships, direction and decision making process which in reality are the result of good human relationships lead by the administrator or administrative team.

         a. A potential problem is created by the inter-action process since the executive may become too concerned with client groups and not enough concerned with staff groups and board groups. Thus the recognition and interaction of the varied groups is most important.

II. Periodic review and re-definition of the role and function of the agencies plus a period evaluation of the effectiveness of service in accordance with its purpose, goals, and objectives is mandatory.

   A. Need for defined written objectives, purposes, goals plus criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of service.

   B. Need to recognize, accept and practice the belief that there is a better way to do work, i.e., an open mind to change and better productivity; a hard look into what, when, where and how agency's services should be effected.

III. Administration must participate at all levels of planning relative to its role in relationship to social welfare changes be they at local, state or federal levels.

   A. Board and administration must work to effect social changes to make sure that the national and/or state changes have a salutory effect on the local groups with whom the agency had immediate contact.

   B. Board should also be involved to make sure that the local,

state or national social changes might even produce world-wide implications of benefit to all handicapped personnel in similar areas of social concern.

C. Administration should make sure that there is a real relationship by its agency with the community.

1. Administration and Board should increase and improve the effectiveness of its communications on all levels with governmental groups.

a. Stimulation of such might become available from the acceptance of administration and boards of agencies of the up-to-date teachings and theories of the varied disciplines within the educational facilities of its own locale, i.e., seminars, invited speakers, representation of faculty on board and administrative committees, consultants from academic areas.

IV. Problem of integrating blind people into sighted society is really a part of the basic human problem of having all people in this nation with equal opportunities for support, inter-relationship and basic understanding of each other, i.e., people.

A. All should be a part of the human race with equal opportunities to achieve his own individual human potential.

SUMMATION

Mrs. Worden concluded the institute by expressing the deep sense of gratitude felt by each attendee to Dean Dumpson for his leadership, stimulation and human approach to the problems being experienced by all present be they public or private, board or staff personnel. It was acknowledged that we were all perhaps a little less secure when we first came to the institute, but that we are now armed with ways and means by which we may now better accomplish our assigned tasks and effect a more smooth, acceptable and effective human relationship with all levels of society with whom our daily tasks bring us in contact.

Mrs. Sausser announced that this Institute was the second Administrative Institute sponsored by AFB in the Northeast Region and asked Miss Cole who had served as registrant for a report. Of the 32 persons present, 22 were from private agencies, 6 from public agencies, 4 guests. There were 18 Administrators, 10 board members, 2 persons from AFB, and 2 speakers. Attendees represented 18 agencies from all 6 New England States and New York. New Jersey was not represented. Mrs. Sausser asked for an expression of opinion regarding the Institute's content and format. There was unanimous acclaim for the content of the Institute, and Dean Dumpson's excellent leadership. It was voted that there should be a repeat of the Institute at as early a date as possible and that if AFB could not fund another Institute in the Northeast in

1968, a registration fee could be charged to cover expenses. Mr. Friedenson, of the New York Commission, expressed a desire to consider possible financial support. The group recommended that future Institutes might focus on the "humanness" of Administration, use of authority in Administration, ways and means of better evaluating effective board and administrative actions according to social changes. All registrants felt that there was need to keep the momentum that was generated by this Institute moving, and that it was most important that more board members and executives be present hereafter.

A suggestion was also given that a workshop type institute might be arranged with specific areas of concern being discussed by groups in order that a larger gamit of concerns might be covered. In any event, the entire group gave Mrs. Sausser, Miss Morrison and Dean Dumpson a standing ovation to show their debt of gratitude to them for all that they did to make this institute have such far reaching impact upon the attendees and we trust the clientele whom we will serve in the months ahead.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

NAME	TITLE AND AGENCY
Owen Pollard, Chairman	Director Eye Care and Special Services Augusta, Maine
Virginia Cole	Director Division for the Blind Montpelier, Vermont
Oscar Friedenson	Director Commission for the Blind and Visually Handicapped New York, New York
Joseph Pike	Executive Director Albany Association of the Blind Albany, New York
Wesley Sprague	Executive Director New York Association for the Blind New York, New York
Helen Worden	Executive Director Rhode Island Association for the Blind Providence, Rhode Island
Mrs. Doris Sausser	Director, Community Services Division American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York
A. Marie Morrison	Regional Consultant American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York

PARTICIPANTS IN ADMINISTRATIVE INSTITUTE

NAME	TITLE AND AGENCY
Abrams, Mrs. Robert	President of the Board Boston Aid to the Blind Boston, Massachusetts
Bailer, Frederick O.	President of the Board Syracuse Association for the Blind Syracuse, New York
Beltz, Jeannette H.	Executive Director Worcester County Center for the Blind Worcester, Massachusetts
Buckley, Helen	Executive Secretary Glens Falls Association for the Blind Glens Falls, New York
Carolan, Rev. Robert H.	Director of Rehabilitation Catholic Guild for all the Blind Newtown, Massachusetts
Carusone, Mrs. Louis	President of the Board Glens Falls Association for the Blind Glens Falls, New York
Clock, Audrey	Board Member Cattaraugus County Association for Aid to the Blind, Inc. Olean, New York
Cole, Virginia	Director Division for the Blind Montpelier, Vermont
Dumpson, James	Dean Fordham University, School of Social Work New York, New York
Falk, Mrs. Alfred F.	President of the Board Massachusetts Association for the Blind Boston, Massachusetts
Flynn, Mr. Donald	Board Member Rhode Island Association for the Blind Rhode Island, New York

NAME	TITLE AND AGENCY
Friedenson, Oscar	Director Commission for the Blind and Visually Handicapped New York, New York
Gabel, Arthur	Executive Director Boston Aid to the Blind Boston, Massachusetts
Greenspon, Daisy	Guest The Associated Blind, Inc. New York, New York
Hall, Rev. Martin J.	Director Catholic Charities-Special Services Division Massapequa Park, New York
Hayes, Adelaide	Executive Secretary Buffalo Association for the Blind Buffalo, New York
Johns Jr., Frank	Superintendent Connecticut Institute for the Blind Hartford, Connecticut
Larkin III, Mrs. John D.	Secretary of Board Buffalo Association for the Blind Buffalo, New York
Luke, Mrs. Douglas	Vice-President of the Board Glens Falls Association for the Blind Glens Falls, New York
McCollam, H. Kenneth	Executive Director State of Connecticut- Board of Education and Services for the Blind Hartford, Connecticut
Morrison, A. Marie	Regional Consultant American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York
Moseley Jr., Frederick	President of the Board New York Association for the Blind New York, New York
Nolan, Mrs. Grace M.	Director The Catholic Guild for the Blind Buffalo, New York

NAME	TITLE AND AGENCY
Patterson, Mr. John P.	Chairman of the Board Commission for the Blind and Visually Handicapped New York, New York
Pike, Joseph W.	Executive Director Albany Association of the Blind Albany, New York
Pollard, C. Owen	Director Eye Care and Special Services Augusta, Maine
Rosenblum, Milton	Director Syracuse Association of Workers for the Blind Syracuse, New York
Sausser, Mrs. Doris	Director, Division of Community Services American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York
Selis, Irving M.	Executive Director The Associated Blind, Inc. New York, New York
Shea, Rev. Robert	Board Member State of Connecticut- Board of Education and Services for the Blind Hartford, Connecticut
Smith, Eleanor	Assistant Regional Consultant Department of Health, Education and Welfare Boston, Massachusetts
Sprague, Wesley D.	Executive Director The New York Association for the Blind New York, New York
Stickler, Mr. Gale N.	Executive Director New Hampshire Association for the Blind Concord, New Hampshire
Stockman, Leo V.	Secretary to the Board Albany Association for the Blind Albany, New York
Tallman, Charles V.	Board Member New Hampshire Association for the Blind Concord, New Hampshire

NAME	TITLE AND AGENCY
Worden, Helen	Executive Director Rhode Island Association for the Blind Providence, Rhode Island